-2

EA/ja

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

MEETING

AUDITORIUM
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR BUILDING
EIGHTEENTH AND C STREETS, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D. C.

FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1974 9:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

MEMBERS: H. A. TRUE, JR., Chairman HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON, Co-Chairman VINCENT M. BROWN, Executive Director JACK H. ABERNATHY CARROL M. BENNETT C. H. MURPHY, JR. WILTON E. SCOTT HONORABLE JAMES L. BUCKLEY HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SIMON DUKE R. LIGON 

Acme Reporting Company

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	AGENDA ITEM		PAGE
3	Call to Order - Chairman H. A. True, Jr.		3
ŧ	Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton Secretary		3
<b>5</b>	Department of the Interior		
6	Honorable William E. Simon Administrator		13
7	Federal Energy Office		
8	Honorable James L. Buckley United States Senate		24
9	Introduction of Guests - Chairman H. A. True,	Jr.	34
0 -	Introduction of New Members - Vincent M. Brown	<b>A</b> 12.	35
1	Discussion		36
2	C. H. Murphy, Jr.		57
3	Vice Chairman Committee on Energy Conservation		
4	R. C. McCay		61
5	Chairman Coordinating Committee		
6	Carrol M. Bennett		76
7	Chairman Committee on Emergency Preparedness		
.8	Kenneth E. Hill		79
9	Chairman Subcommittee on Materials and Manpower		
0	Requirements for Petroleum Exploration, Drilling and Production		
1	Earl W. Unruh		83
2	Chairman Technical Subcommittee		
3	Committee on Petroleum Storage Capacity		3
4	Wilton E. Scott Chairman	·	86
	Committee on Ocean Petroleum Resources		
5	<b>Ⅱ</b>		

Acme Reporting Company

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
3	Cecil J. Olmstead	90
4	Chairman Coordinating Subcommittee	
5	Vincent M. Brown	<sub>900,60</sub> 97
6	Executive Director National Petroleum Council	
7	Duke R. Ligon	100
8	Director U. S. Office of Oil and Gas	
9	Jack H. Abernathy	102
10	Chairman Budget Committee	
11,		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	II	

-00000-

Acme Reporting Company

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Welcome to the second meeting of the National

Petroleum Council for the 1974 Fiscal Year.

As we have a lot of business to do this morning, and as each will be introduced to you during the course of the morning, I will dispense with the formality of introducing the head table.

We will also dispense with the custom of calling the role, and the official attendance record will be made at the door. Any Council members who did not check in at the door, please do so before you leave so that our record will be complete.

This morning, it is a great pleasure for me to introduce the distinguished Government Co-Chairman of the Council, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior.

Rogers?

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROGERS C. B. MORTON,

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

SECRETARY MORTON: Thank you, Dave.

Members of the Council, and our distinguished quests.

It is certainly a pleasure to have Bill Simon,

Acme Reporting Company

. 

John Sawhill, and other members of the Federal Energy Office here with us this morning. I know we are all anxious to hear from Bill.

I would like to take only a few, informal minutes this morning to share with you some of our thoughts, and to perhaps request of you some help.

I think the President did the right thing when he charged us all in the Government and the country to become energy self-sufficient by 1980.

The definition of "self-sufficiency" I think is something that has to be worked out. There are some differences of opinion on the preciseness of it.

The obvious proposition is to substantially increase the supply of conventional fuels. Any of the unconventional or non-conventional energy systems require a lead time that will really not affect the energy supply during the period 1974 to 1980, in this six-year period. I think we all know that.

Obviously, there will be some production of synthetic fuels based on the rate of speed that investment is made in the existing technologies.

When you project that out to 1980, you see that, at best, you would be in sort of a demonstration level type of business that would give you some real yardstick information and data as far as the balance of the century is

O

-25

concerned; for example, in the use of fuels from coal; the use of oil from shale; the use of breeder reactors as an addition to the light water generation, and so forth; and you can even visualize some substantial energy uses derived from solar energy.

What we are really talking about, and I think we ought to put it in its perspective, and we ought to try to entice the public into reaching an understanding of it, which is very difficult to do, is the increase of oil and gas and some coal in the period of 1974 to 1980.

You are concerned with not only where you are going to get it, but what the economics of it are going to be, and this I think should be all our concern.

I believe we should be studying the economic side of this industry as it goes into a production phase that has been accelerated over any past or historic base.

We are through the crisis element. I think we laid it to rest pretty well last night. They tried to make the energy crisis funny, and I must admit that both Fred Hartley and John Sawhill did a pretty good job at the dinner for TV people.

I hope we laid to rest, at least with the ones who were sitting on each side of me, that the whole thing had been contrived by a few of the oil companies, and that now we were at least faced with a realistic future in terms of

b

actually developing our supplies.

I did not hear much talk last night about splitting up the oil companies because they had schemed on this thing; whereas, a couple of months ago, you probably would have heard a lot in that particular group. It is funny how quick things change around here.

What I would like for the Petroleum Council to do is to become involved in advising us on policy in this development phase that we are looking at between 1974 and 1980.

If you will just look quickly at the whole structure system under the American Flag, the first, obvious fact is that the opportunity exists primarily in the short-term on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The policy which has been in effect and making available lands on the Outer Continental Shelf over the years for the last twenty years, has been more money-oriented. I think, in terms of the Government's side, than production-oriented.

Actually, the amount of revenue that has been developed over those years from gas and oil revenues on the Outer Continental Shelf splits about one-third/two-thirds; two-thirds to governments, Federal and State governments; and one-third through the cash registers of the producers.

This has been an economic formula that has not really produced the kind of production that we wish we had

when the Israeli-Arab War triggered the embargo.

Based on the price of oil, we have seen over the twenty-year period where OCS production has existed, and based on the price of gas, it is certainly an understandable fact, and we certainly have no reason to criticize the industry or ourselves for having proceeded in the development of this resource so slowly.

What I want to do is try and look at everything we have done with a critical eye to see what is right about it, and also to determine where it can be improved.

I think the real sounding board, and the real advice and counsel that can be put into what we do here in Interior in our responsibility, and what Bill Simon can do in the Energy Office in his over-all policy responsibility, as well as the other agencies that are involved, particularly those that deal with the back-up systems; with steel, and tubing, and pipe, and labor, and all the rest.

We are going to give you a charge, and the charge is to become involved in the policy decisions through advice and counsel, which is your proper role, that will lead to the success of Project Independence.

I have some goals in mind that may be too far out; maybe they need modifying; and maybe you should address your-selves to those as well as to the policies through which we implement our programs to reach those goals.

It seems to me that a fair figure would be during the six-year period to bring the production, in terms of oil equivalent of the Outer Continental Shelf, up to a multiple of five compared to what it is today.

There are some legal constraints, as well as certainly economic and back-up system constraints, that have to be overcome; one is the sovereignty question which involves the Atlantic. It looks as though we are getting down to the end of the line on the sovereignty question as it affects the Cook Inlet area in Alaska.

Certainly, the procedures that will be necessary to do the kind of thing that we are talking about, multiply the production by five, will entail moving into frontier areas. I think we want to look at that in terms of how we do it.

The old question of whether the bonus-bidding system that we use now, or the heavy front-money system that we use now really will get the job done in terms of increasing supplies is being reexamined.

I am not going to tell you all of the different formulae and thoughts that we have because this is not the place.

I am going to see if Dave and Vince Brown can put together a kind of a task force or committee within the Council that can take a hard look at our over-all leasing

Acme Reporting Company

policy and come up either with some options or some answers or some criticisms of the various proposals that we are considering, as well as a rather hard look at the procedures we have used over the last few years.

The other area that I think we have to be thinking about, in terms of technological transfer of where the investment is coming from, in terms of who is going to do it and what the incentives are, and what the economics are, is in the area of secondary and tertiary recovery.

All ready, the technology is being advanced at a fairly rapid rate, both on the Government side as well as on the proprietary side.

Whether we have reached a price plateau and an economic environment in which there can be a reasonable return on that investment is something I think we have to consider.

They look to me as though they are the two, big pools of oil that we might be able to add to our supply between 1974 and 1980; the oil that is yet to be produced on the Outer Continental Shelf, in terms of additions to supply, and the oil that is available in known structures and producing areas for secondary recovery is the only way to get it.

The last thing that I mention is that I do not think we can get from here to there unless we have a more

realistic gas policy. You know what we are trying to do in terms of deregulation of gas.

Again, I think it is proper for the Council to address itself to this problem.

I think the best way for us to proceed here this morning is for me to relinquish this podium to Bill Simon.

Then, at the end of his remarks, if you want to address some questions to me or to him, I am sure that he will welcome them.

A lot of questions have been asked me about how we in Interior relate to the Federal Energy Office.

I think, as I see it, and as I think it is functioning, the over-all energy policy of the Government to bring all of the agencies, and there are a good many agencies involved in this, together is a responsibility of the Federal Energy Office.

The arms through which that responsibility can be carried out are the line agencies, the agencies that have a specific responsibility in certain areas, such as the Department of Interior with the wide responsibilities that we have through our Bureau of Mines, through our Office of Coal Research, through the Bureau of Public Land Management, and through the Geological Survey.

Obviously, we are a Government Agency with specific action responsibilities, and we intend to carry out that

responsibility within the policy framework that we are trying to set for ourselves during the last quarter of this century.

There is not here a hydra-headed situation in which one agency is going one way, and another agency is going the other way.

Sometimes, in the late afternoon, there is a sense that what I have just said is not true.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: When we wake up the next day, and realize what we are trying to do, and perhaps in a small way readjust our courses on each side, we again get going on the track.

I think the wisdom that the President exhibited is establishing within hiw own Presidency an energy coordinator — I think that is a little better American term than "czar" — take it or leave it. I do not want to defrock the czar this morning.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I think that this Council still has, and even more than in the past, an advisory responsibility through its regular channels that will serve the Federal Energy Office to a very high degree.

I hope that Bill Simon refers to that opportunity that the Council has.

J

<del>4</del> 

 $^{22}$ 

Let us see if we can, during this time of development of American energy and American energy policy, bring the National Petroleum Council closer in to the policy development of all of our procedures in which they are interested during this critical time here in the balance of 1974 and in the Fiscal Year coming of 1975.

There is no point in having the Petroleum Council if it is just going to be another trade association. You all ready have the Petroleum Institute, and a very good organization it is, and a very well-run organization it is.

This is an advisory organization, and I think that it is up to this National Petroleum Council to be advisory in a positive sense, as well as giving us critical opinions when they are deserved.

I am going to ask you to do a lot more in terms of telling us not only what is right and what is wrong, but helping us to find a way to go in which there will be a continued and good return on investment, in which there will be a steady increase in supplies, and in which we can build a foundation on a new kind of industry that is dealing with a different situation than we have had in the past, where large amounts of fuel and surplus have been the order of the day.

We are obviously looking at a long period of time when energy is going to be more scarce, and when there is going to be a different kind of economic plateau on which

this business will be conducted.

Expect to do some work. I am going to ask for it.

I think that you are undoubtedly, from the individuals I have talked to, ready to perform.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your very appropriate and timely remarks.

We, as the Council, appreciate the continuing opportunity to advise you and your Department. I assure you, Mr. Secretary, that we will do our best to carry out and follow through on the charges that you have given us this morning.

You have probably seen more of the next speaker in the papers and on the news media on a daily basis than you have of your own wives and children. I know I have.

It is indeed a great honor to introduce to you the Honorable William Simon, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, and Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

(Applause.)

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SIMON,
ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL ENERGY OFFICE
MR. SIMON: Thank you, Dave.

Rog, you can defrock me anytime you would like to.

I think that maybe there was justification to have

Acme Reporting Company

a czar during a crisis; but now that it is a problem, maybe I ought to be a coordinator.

(General laughter.)

MR. SIMON: I am delighted to be here today, and I hope that we will have a chance to have a little give and take, whether it is just after my remarks or later in the morning, and have an exchange of ideas so that it is not just the usual Government bureaucrats speaking without response.

I would like to discuss with you very briefly what
I believe lies ahead in the area of Federal energy policy.

My comments are going to fall in really two, major areas:

one, the short-term outlook; and, two, the Federal Energy

Office's role for the longer term, encompassing, of course,

Project Independence, as well as the immediate need and

dramatic need for legislation this year.

As for the short-term outlook, with the embargo lifted, the production returning to pre-embargo levels, the days of severe shortages are over, even though we know that it will take two months, approximately, for the supply to begin to trickle back on our shores again.

We are going to continue to stress, to warn that if the demand were to resume its normal, historic growth rate, that we are going to have problems, and we are going to have shortages, and the shortages could be in the extent of four to six percent this summer.

Acme Reporting Company

J

q

However, we feel that with increased prices, with
the mandatory conservation measures, our oil-to-coal switching programs, and the continued cooperation, which I personally
feel we are going to get, from the American people, that
essentially we will not have a shortage; it will be a manageable problem.

Although we might experience some spot problems throughout the country as we have indeed last year, we will be able to handle these through our allocation program.

Given this new petroleum situation, we are going to alter some of our current programs. The Allocation Program will be modified to make it more responsive to world supply conditions.

As you know, the Crude Program is presently being modified to remove the disincentives to imports. We are going to continue to provide 100 percent of current needs for agriculture as well as essential services.

With increasing supplies, we will assure that all industry will get 100 percent of its requirements.

To date, the economy has been mostly isolated from the impact of the energy problem, but we must provide the needed fuel for industrial growth and for jobs.

Gasoline, in the allocation area, will be gradually increased in the months ahead as the supplies increase.

However, a continued program -- and this is the

fine line that we are going to have to continue to walk -of energy conservation is a necessity, recognizing that we
cannot go back to our old ways.

We are going to, in the Federal Energy Office and all components of Government, continue a vigorous public education effort, and I know that industry will do the same.

Mandatory conservation measures, such as the fiftyfive mile-an-hour speed limit, indoor lighing standards, are still a good idea. We intend to continue them.

Our more focused measures, like Sunday gas sales and bans or prohibiting outdoor lighting, however, are going to be eliminated because of their potential impact on very narrow economic sectors.

We must mount new efforts to bring back certainty into fuel supply, into the attitudes, and this is the difficult fine line, while maintaining that delicate balance so that people do not think that the problem has been solved, but that indeed this was an embargo that induced prices.

The auto industry, tourism and the recreation industries have suffered inordinately. It is very difficult for anyone -- I have not talked to anyone who knew how we could help industries that were so dependent on petroleum and petroleum products, as well as consumer attitudes.

When a person is afraid, and believes that he is not going to be able to get sufficient supplies of gasoline,

he is not going to buy an automobile that will get eight miles to a gallon. He is not going to take a trip if he believes he is going to have trouble either getting there or getting back home.

We all must recognize, as I have learned only too graphically in the past few months, that tourism, as far as the economies of some states, is as important as basic industry is to many others; steel, aluminum. They have suffered due to this uncertainty and the change in the attitudes.

we want to assure the people that with normal conservation practices, as described, that they will have a sufficiency to meet their needs.

We will, at the same time -- here, again, it almost seems like we are talking out of both sides of our mouths -- continue to stress conservation.

As far as the longer term is concerned, it seems that we are going through three phases in this problem. The first phase began a long time ago, about fifteen or eighteen years, and lasted for about twelve to fifteen years, and you might call it the "I-don't-believe-it phase"; all of the warnings that we all know, that you know only better than I do.

We have moved from the I-don't-believe-it stage to the scapegoat stage, which we are in presently, where

everyone is pointing their finger at everyone else, and finding who is to blame for this situation we find ourselves in today.

We must move out of this second phase and into the important third phase about solving the problem, which we have the ability to do.

As for the longer term, if we are to ultimately find workable solutions to these problems, we must allow our markets to operate.

Price controls and allocations are temporary measures. They are not consistent with our long-range energy policy.

Let me assure this group that price and quantity regulations will be phased out so that prices, supply and consumption in this country can return to equilibrium.

As you know, the allocation system, as the supplies return 100 percent of current requirements, especially, obviously, immediately in the middle distillate area, will make it easier for you to conform with this program.

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act extended the price controls for petroleum until February, 1975.

I do not have to recite to your industry how the spiraling demand outran our domestic capability to meet it. Suffice to say that these trends are no longer acceptable economically, politically or for national defense.

To approach self-sufficiency, we need a manifold approach to energy policy. We must establish a central energy organization in the Federal Government. The Federal Energy Office is only the first step toward bringing all policy and implementation under one roof.

We need Federal Energy Administration legislation, and have needed it. It has been languishing on the Hill with our other, much needed legislation; energy research and development, as well as ultimately the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

We must have a permanent conservation ethic in this country. Consumers must not revert to old patterns of wasteful usage. We cannot reverse the trend in imports if the demand continues to spiral upwards.

We must remember, as far as this Administration is concerned, that conservation must be a matter of free choice, not a mandated imperative. Nonetheless, it is going to have to become a permanent part of our lives.

We must accelerate the development of our massive, untapped domestic energy potential; our resources of coal, shale, oil and gas, the Outer Continental Shelf, and nuclear can and must be used.

A new relationship between Government and industry must be forged. There must be a comprehensive reporting system. Our energy data must be complete and timely, and

we must be able to verify its accuracy.

There has to be a new role for Government in international energy affairs. Industry and Government must work together to assure the most efficient production and use of energy sources.

Finally, we have to forge a new structure of international cooperation within the world community between producing as well as consuming nations.

In implementing Project Independence, there is one, overriding theme; and that is, that the Government's role is not to build and own and manage and run the various facilities.

The Government's role is to assist, to clear away the impediments so that industry can get on with this critical job, allow the market system to operate in an unencumbered fashion.

We will expedite and assist and coordinate in every way possible in this way.

We have established in our Project Independence group an Early Action Task Force. This task force is working on breaking bottlenecks and administrative red tape, and other problems encountered in getting new supplies of coal, oil or nuclear power to the market place.

It helps to site refineries, reducing the nuclear licensing delays, and clearing up material shortages for coal mining. All of these are just brief examples of what this

Acme Reporting Company

group is performing.

A small group in the Federal Energy Office will coordinate and focus all of the Federal Government's activities in this area.

the Project Independence Blueprint effort. A month ago, we commenced the integration of the Federal Energy Office into the economic framework of the Government - the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisors, the Cost of Living Council, the Office of Management and Budget - to assess the costs and exact feasibilities of Project Independence; the capacity, the supply problems.

This is a planning effort which will culminate in a detailed, quantitative plan with policy recommendations to achieve self-sufficiency in the 1980's.

It will evaluate technical and resource potential barriers, and incentives to remove them.

An interagency group is all ready at work on this, and our analysis will be completed before the end of this year.

Project Independence Blueprint or not, we need Congressional action if we are to move towards self-sufficiency, to remove the impediments for our free enterprise system to function.

We have seventeen bills -- and this was written a

	шлср	3 ed	re t	e 9/	1 '59651	ed :	tad)	day	FAGIA	o pur	'III	:н эцэ	uo
gie	y set	<b>a</b>	MOU	Āq	смейсу	<b>0</b> 3	đn	9d J	qbym 3	i ob	ago	ggys	MƏJ

The legislation affects almost every aspect of our program, Legislation could give us the necessary agencies to do this job; FEA, ERDA, and, of course, ultimately, DENR; the Mandatory Reporting Bill, the deregulation of natural gas, power plant siting, Elk Hills, strip mining, deep water ports, amendments to the Clean Air Act, just to name a few.

When we finish our Project Independence Blueprint,

I am sure that even more legislative changes are going to be
needed, and needed quickly. It must be a year of Congressional
action. We welcome debate, and we are willing to work long
and hard to reach workable compromises.

The Federal Government is changing, the citizens, attitudes are changing, and your industry is changing. A new

The Government and the public are demanding more information concerning your operation. Mandatory legislation now pending will provide this.

While there must be a balance between public and proprietary information, that balance has not been struck, and we know that you will support these efforts.

There must a new emphasis on increasing domestic

Acme Reporting Company

97

77

23

77

12

07

6T

LI

91

12

ÞΙ

71

ΙŢ

0T

The list goes on and on.

farther behind.

supply. Many current or past programs provide disincentives to increase domestic exploration, production and refining.

We are committed to providing incentives, and removing barriers to domestic production. You, simultaneously, must recommit yourselves to an aggressive and wide-ranging program of domestic development.

We must also have a spirt of cooperation in developing and bringing to commercial availability a whole new spectrum of technology to give us the self-sufficiency.

Achieving the ability for self-sufficiency is going to take the cooperation and commitment of all of us; Government officials, leaders of industry and individual citizens. It is a massive task, and it will take all of the help and the determination that we can muster.

It is worth reiterating that what Government can do is to provide the conditions; the free, unencumbered market place that has in the past, and will again in the future, evoke the traditional response from the greatest industrialized nation that this world has ever known.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Mr. Simon, for your candid and challenging comments.

We in the petroleum industries appreciate the magnitude of the job that still lies ahead of the Federal

Energy Office. As the National Petroleum Council, we 1 2 certainly hope that as suggested by our Government Co-Chairman, Secretary Morton, that we, as a council, can be 4 helpful, too. It now gives me a great deal of pleasure to 5 introduce to you a Senator I have known and admired for 6 7 Several years. James L. Buckley has served the State of New York as a Senator since 1971, and is an active member of the 9 Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Committee 10 on Public Works, and the Select Committee on Small Business. 11 A frend of the free enterprise system, and a fine 12 Senator, Senator James L. Buckley. 13 (Applause.) 14 STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES L. BUCKLEY, 15 UNITED STATES SENATE: 16 SENATOR BUCKLEY: Thank you very much. 17 It is a great pleasure to be here in front of this 18 very august body. 19 If I may, I would like to just touch on a few 20 subjects, and perhaps answer questions, if that would be of 21 interest to you. 22 I think that you are all reasonably familiar with 23 much of the legislation that is before the Congress, much 24

of the thrust of that legislation.

I think that you are probably not all that familiar with some of the fine print as it might affect not only the petroleum industry, but industry at large down the line.

First of all, I ought to tell you something about my credentials, as I come from New York, and you are concerned with an industry that is not normally associated with that state.

Some weeks ago, when we opened up debate on the very controversial roll-back provisions of the Energy Act, I, along with three other Senators, Senators Bartlett, Fannin and Hansen, got up on our hind feet to talk about the perils involved for the nation in trying to put on a lid on the workings of the market place.

We like to think that by getting up on our hind legs, we can add to the educative process in the country.

I was arguing that the consumer has a direct, important interest in allowing the incentives to work so that we could develop our domestic resources and liberate ourselves from dependence on foreign sources.

The next day, I looked at the "New York Times" to see if some of our words of wisdom had trickled through, and our three hours of oratory was dismissed by a single sentence; namely, "Several oil state Senators spoke up in opposition to the measure."

(General laughter.)

 $^{24}$ 

SENATOR BUCKLEY: Knowing that the "New York Times" never makes an error, I quickly telephoned the Department of Resources of New York State, and found out, lo and behold, that New York is an oil state.

I found out that we have 5,700 oil wells that are producing the aggregate of 2,700 barrels a day, or less than a half a barrel per well per day.

(General laughter.)

SENATOR BUCKLEY: I also found out that we are producing one million cubic feet of gas a day, or one-half of one percent of our total consumption.

I also found out something tremendously interesting, and that is, that since the freeing up of gas prices occurred, and since the stripper provisions were enacted, oil exploration in New York had increased by 400 percent.

Reservoirs that had been closed down years and years ago were being reopened, and people were drilling 10,000 foot wells.

I think we sort of have in minuscule a demonstration of what free economy and a free economy approach will do for this industry, will do for the consumer, will do in developing those resources that remain to be developed.

Mr. Simon, who is a most admirable man, was speaking a little earlier about the need for legislation, and also about the need to rely and liberate the free market

economy.

The problem is that the people in the Congress do not necessarily see eye to eye with Mr. Simon, or with me. Also, the problem is, if we start setting up broad, new authorities, broad, new bureaus, we are apt in the future not to have somebody of the impeccable judgment of Mr. Simon in charge.

I would like to take this occasion to talk to you about some of the implications of some of the legislation that is now being discussed seriously on the Hill because I believe not only are we in danger of establishing a pattern that can crucify the oil and gas industry, but, in the process, we will establish a pattern that inevitably will be applied next time around to aluminum, the time after that to the automobile industry, or any industry that happens to be the whipping boy of the time.

I want to tell you about this, not only because of your own interest in the oil and gas industry, but also because I believe that if we are to stop some forces now in motion, we will have to enlist the attention, the interest of all American industry, and I appeal to you to do that.

Let me just give you two examples of what I am talking about. One of them, I am sure you are aware of, is a proposal introduced by Senator Jackson that would, in effect, establish a system of national chartering for the oil

Acme Reporting Company

•

. 

industry.

This would inevitably allow bureaucrats to establish all kinds of standards of performance, all kinds of standards of information revelation on oil and gas.

One of the proposals involves mandating that there be kind of a Ralph Nader type on your board of directors who would be paid by you, entitled to your pension plans, and all the rest of it, but whose duty would not be to your stockholders; whose duty it would be to do the sort of thing that Ralph Nader does.

(General laughter.)

discussing another bill that has as its purpose something that we all agree needs to be done; namely, we need somehow to collect in one place the kind of information that is necessary to enable the Federal Government to have some kind of a grasp on accurate energy information, and thereby equipping itself for some sort of intelligent planning.

All well and good, and we all agree that that is necessary, but let me give you just some selections from the "Committee Print," Number 3, of the National Energy Information System that currently is being discussed in the Interior Committee.

Number one, the "Statement of Purposes" states that "It is the purpose of this act to make all information

Acme Reporting Company

public" -- all information public -- "that is not for one reason or another defined as confidential." 2 This applies to all energy industries, and all energy industries are defined as the following lines of commerce: One, exploration for or development of mineral fuel resources or non-mineral energy resources. 7 Two, extraction. 8 Three, refining. 9 Four, the generation, transmission or storage of 10 electrical energy. 11 Five, transportation. 12 Six, wholesale or retail distribution and sales. 13 Then it goes on to say that "Major energy 14 companies means a corporation which alone or with its affil-15 iates is involved in business activities in one or more of 16 the energy industries, or which consumes significant amounts 17 of mineral fuels or electrical energy." 18 In other words, just about any activity in the 19 country remotely associated with the production, processing, 20 transportation or consumption of energy would automatically 21 come under the purview of this legislation at the direction 22 of a future administrator. 23 Then, we come to the scope of the inquiry, which 24

Acme Reporting Company

would fall within the responsibility of the administrator of

this new bureau.

It says, "The administrator or any officer or employee of the administration designated by him shall have right of entry to the real property and access to any books, documents, papers, statistics, data, information and records of any company, business, institution, establishment or organization of any nature whatever when the purpose of such access is to obtain or verify energy information which they are authorized by this Act to obtain."

This means, in effect, that a future administrator could have somebody side by side with your geologist examining the bits and cuttings as they come up on an important wildcat well, and the presumption is that this information is public information, available through an electronic network to anybody in any major city in the United States.

This proposed legislation does provide for classification, although it makes it clear that the burden of proof is to establish that information not be made public.

In any event, under the appropriate provision, we see that "energy information received by the administrator shall, in general, be classified public.

"Energy information shall be classified confidential if:

"One, the officer of the company responsible for submitting such information swears under oath that the

Acme Reporting Company

16.

 $\dot{2}0$ 

23.

company has not disclosed the information directly or indirectly to any person who is not employed by the company"; presumably, not your partners, not the bank you borrow money from, or anyone else.

"Two, the company shows by clear and convincing evidence that such information constitutes a trade secret, or that disclosure of such information would cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the company.

"C., notwithstanding a sworn statement of an affirmative finding by the administrator, the administrator shall classify public any energy information when he finds:

"One, that such energy information is in the possession of any person not employed by the company; or

"Two, the benefit to the public interest in immediately classifying such information public outweighs the demonstrated harm to the competitive position of the company; or

"Three, the energy information is of a geological, engineering, seismic, geomagnetic, gravitational, or geochemic nature pertaining to undeveloped mineral fuel or non-mineral energy resources on Federally-leased lands that is more than one year old, or on privately-owned lands if that information is more than two years old."

All of your seismic work, all of your regional geologizing, therefore, is opened up to the public within

two years' time at the latest.

Then we go on to suggest that there is a duty of cooperation, not only on domestic companies, but on foreign companies.

"The administrator shall collect from substantial energy resource companies and major energy companies such energy information as they may possess which is acquired to achieve the purposes of this Act."

Then it goes on to say, "It shall be the duty of every company, foreign and domestic, to report annually to the administrator full and complete details of all mineral fuel resources and non-mineral energy resources which it, together with its affiliates, owns or controls anywhere in the world."

I could go on, but I will not. I think I have made my point.

I believe that we are on the verge of significant legislation that will transform our system of a free, private, competitive enterprise.

I believe that whereas you are the people, you represent the industry where these theories will first be tested; that if they are adopted by the Congress, if this mood to extend Federal control over every area of our society is not checked, that we will, in a few years' time, see the pattern of disclosure, the pattern of control, the pattern of

Acme Reporting Company

5.

regulation now being suggested for your industry extended over every sector of the American economy.

If there are any questions I can answer with respect to the Congress, I would be happy to do so, or try to do so.

(No response.)

SENATOR BUCKLEY: Thank you very much.

I do plead with you to understand that you need allies. You need allies in the Congress, you need allies in other industries if you are to persuade this Congress not to enact revolutionary legislation in response to the oil shortage crisis, and if we are to educate the public to some of the basic facts of life, economic facts of life of your industry.

One of the things that has astonished me since coming into the Congress is the extent of the ignorance by good and honest men, honorable men, of how our system works, what makes it tick.

There is no understanding of why people risk money, why people will scrape and save and invest in ventures where the odds against success are overwhelming.

Yet, it is the willingness of people in the oil and gas industry to continue making those risks that enables our economy to wobble along as well as it is.

Thank you very much.

Thank you very muc

(Applause.)

Z

J

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Senator Buckley, for your very thought-provoking and somewhat frightening comments this morning.

We will try to follow through as individuals.

At the risk of missing someone, I should introduce

-- enhanced by the fact that I really cannot see out there
to know who is here. There are a few distinguished guests
here this morning that I would like to introduce to you.

Jack Rigg, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Jack?

Dr. Vincent McKelvey, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey.

John Sawhill, Deputy Administrator, Federal Energy Office.

Steve Wakefield, Assistant Administrator, Federal Energy Office, for International Energy Affairs.

John Knuble, Deputy Assistant Administrator,
Federal Energy Office, for International Energy Affairs.

Thank you, and welcome to each of you. We are delighted to have you aboard.

At this time, I would like to ask Vincent Brown, Executive Director of the Council, to introduce the new members who have been appointed since our last meeting in

1	Vince?		
2	MR. BROWN: May I introduce those new members who		
3	are present this morning.		
4	Mr. L. N. Applegate of the Ethyl Corporation.		
5	Mr. Herbert Clay, Chairman of the American Gas		
6	Association.		
7	Ken Hill of Blyth, Eastman, Dillon and Company.		
8	Somebody really new to you, Minor Jameson,		
9	consultant.		
10	John Miller, President of the Independent		
11	Petroleum Association.		
12	Jeff Montgomery, Chairman of the Board of Kirby		
13	Industries.		
14	Mr. Seymour, President of Consolidated Natural		
15	Gas Company.		
16	C. P. Siess, Junior, President of APCO Oil.		
17	Netum Steed, independent oil producer.		
18	Gerry Vinson, oil and gas producer.		
19	Jack Warren, independent producer.		
20	Ivan West, President of the Association of Oil		
21	Well Servicing Contractors.		
22	Thank you, gentlemen.		
23	CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Vince.		
24	I certainly would like to add my personal welcome		
24 25	to the new members of the Council.		
4J			

The NPC, I believe, has made a significant input towards a better knowledge and understanding of our complex energy industry and problems through the personal efforts of the Council members, which I just cannot say enough for or express sufficient appreciation for.

MR. HAMMON: Mr. True, I may have misunderstood the Secretary, and you may be getting around to it, and I realize that we had to defer to the Senator's excellent address, but if I understood your Co-Chairman, he wanted some discussion from the floor or some questions.

Before we get into all of the other matters, not that I have anything to suggest, I did want to give the Secretary the benefit of suggestions on the topics he touched on.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Jake Hamon.

We certainly plan to avail ourselves of the opportunity that the Secretary has given us, and we might find this an appropriate time to do so.

I would ask each of you, in the interest of keeping our records correct, to identify yourselves as you do ask a question.

We will, at Mr. Hamon's suggestion, declare this meeting open for questions to the Secretary.

SECRETARY MORTON: Since we are going to proceed along these lines, it might be good for me to put just a very

little capsule of some of the problems as we see them, and some of the questions we want to address ourselves to.

First, is the amount of leasing that we should go into on the Continental Shelf.

As you know, we have gone from about a million acres a year to a three-million acre plateau. The proposal is, based on the President's wishes, to move in terms of about three times that, possibly to ten million acres a year.

I think we have to take a look, at the end of this program, and make a decision as to what each increment ought to be.

The other thing is the question of bonus money versus royalty money. This has always been a question, and what the Government role should be, if any, in the exploration phase.

Should there be an exploration phase between actual, full-scale leasing and development in an effort perhaps to be more selective in the areas that are leased, and that selectivity, hopefully, reducing the ratio of dry holes to producers.

Those are the kinds of questions, and where and how should we go into the frontier areas, and that sort of thing. These are the things that we are grappling with as far as the offshore is concerned.

Of course, there are many, many problems also in

the revision of the 1920 Leasing Act; the whole question of resource development not only for oil but also for hard rock minerals in the onshore area.

These are the things we are grappling with, and these are the kinds of problems we are going to delineate in a much more detailed manner and lay before the Council so that the Council can organize itself to reflect on them, and then respond to them.

MR. NIELSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Mr. Nielson.

MR. NIELSON: I am Glenn Nielson, Chairman of Husky Oil.

I have particular thoughts on Secretary Morton's comments concerning the large bonuses that have been received from Government.

Having been one of the small companies, comparatively speaking, who has tried to get into that area, we have figured the economics of the bonuses on top of the development has stopped us many a time from participating. If we would have had some other means of participating, we would have been active, along with others.

I am sure that I share the thoughts of a great many of the smaller and medium size producers in commending the Secretary for even raising the question. I think it is a very pertinent one.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Are there any other comments or questions?

MR. SEYMOUR: Mr. Chairman, I am Robert Seymour, Chairman of the Consolidated Natural Gas Company.

My remarks are really directed to Mr. Simon with reference to a remark that he made, but maybe the Honorable Mr. Morton can answer this question.

He spoke of a renewed relationship between

Government and industry. I would like to know just which

direction he expects that to follow because I believe, from

the industry standpoint, every time we come to Washington,

we find ourselves in an adversary position whether we are

trying to do something constructive or not.

I would just like to know whether or not Mr. Morton sees a continuation of that situation?

SECRETARY MORTON: I think your remark is very, very timely. Certainly, I will relay it on to Bill Simon because I think he has some thoughts on it, and will come back to you with his thoughts.

I have found a growing situation in the Executive Branch that is influenced obviously by various consumer organizations, and the effort to be all things to all people, which is a rather difficult posture, the influence of the Congress, trying to be more universal in our attitudes, the result of which has been, I think, a breakdown of the

traditional relationships -- and I am only talking about
the Department of the Interior -- that the Department has
had with industry - the coal industry, on the one hand, the
oil industry, the cattle industry, the resource industry,
the recreation industry - that we should respond to and
work with.

We have to stay within the framework of our Congressional mandate, but I want to assure this organization that I am trying to do in my short tenure here is to make this Department a service to its constituency and not a barrier to the constituencies' effort to do their thing.

I will be very candid with you. I do not think so far I have been 100 percent successful, but I believe we are moving a notch at a time, and if we have to proceed at that pace, that is the pace it will be.

I am sure, from my point of view -- and I wish Bill was here to speak for himself because I am sure he would concur.

We were beginning to move away and become sort of an adversary to the free enterprise system and to the very economic pillars that are the fiber of the economy that we are trying to support and trying to develop.

A great example was, back in the good old days of the energy crisis, when I was the fellow who at that time was charged with the management, along with Duke Ligon, of the

Acme Reporting Company

shortfall, which, to me, is the most -- there is no fun in it at all.

## (General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I said, "Duke, let's you and I go out and get about 250 people out of the industry that know what an oil truck looks like, and know who to call up when they want to get ahold of one of them, and get them out of the industry."

I got an article, an editorial in the "Washington Post" saying how stupid could I be in wanting to go out and get some people from the oil industry to come in and help manage an oil problem.

Well, if this isn't a hell of a country to live in when that is stupid.

what do you do when you get sick? You don't go to a blacksmith.

(Applause.)

SECRETARY MORTON: So -- though sometimes you would kind of like to.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I just want to assure you that if I do not leave anything else here in my wake, I want to try to improve in terms of mutuality the relationship between the Department of Interior, its responsibility to resource development, resource husbanding and conservation, the

relationship with the basic industries who, in themselves, are the only people out on the ground who can do the job.

MR. OLMSTEAD: Cecil Olmstead from Texaco. I on the Council's Seabed Committee.

(Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, I would like to, I suppose, make a comment in the form of a question.

You raised the question of sovereignty about the Outer Continental Shelf, and I assume that applies to the margin as well.

This really raises two questions; one is the case brought by Maine, et al, against the United States, raising again the question of jurisdiction as between the states and the Federal Government for the Continental margin.

I understand that is the hands of a special master up in Philadelphia, referred there by the Supreme Court, and we do not know how far away that is from a decision.

Secondly, and a more immediate concern, is something that this Council has worked on, and I guess here I am asking for reassurance.

In the conference on the Law of the Sea, that is beginning in Caracas in June, are we going to adhere to our position that Coastal States will have jurisdiction over the full extent of the margin, not 200 miles, not 200 meters

 $^{21}$ 

water depth, not 2,500, but for the full margin, down to where it meets the deep ocean floor?

If we do not, I think we run the risk, for the generations ahead, of putting petroleum resources into some regime which those who follow us might place a heavy responsibility upon us for doing.

I suppose what I am asking for is reassurance that we are going to stick to that position.

SECRETARY MORTON: Let me first address the question of the suit filed by the Governor of Maine, et al, on this question of jurisdiction. I think we are probably about fifteen months away from having an opinion on that by the court.

I do not think there is anything you can do to speed it up. We have not learned any tricks over here to speed up the workings of the Supreme Court. There is no way.

Hopefully, we will have a decision so that orderly plans can be made for whatever decisions are made in connection with that frontier.

Of course, I am not alone on the island when it comes to the policy there. You pretty well articulated my position. I will probably have a vote, and it will probably be a minority vote.

I do think that there is an attitude among the

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

people who I have been talking to who are sort of the formulators of the policy that we sort of harden our position on the margin.

What we will actually go to Caracas with in that respect, I really do not know. I feel strongly that way that we should because I think that if that is the universal policy -- the reason that I feel that it should be across the board that way is because I think that the Outer Continental Shelf is more important in the days to come and in the future of the world as a resource development area than it is an area for military defense.

We should technologically go beyond the use of the Outer Continental Shelf as an area for military defense.

I do not think we can economically grow on into the future unless we use the Continental Shelf for energy resources and mineral resources.

MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Fred Hartley.

MR. HARTLEY: Fred Hartley of Union Oil Company of California.

The Secretary and the Administration, I believe, were the original proponents of the concept of the windfall profits tax, as it has been named, an excise tax on crude oil above certain base price levels, and that has now been picked up by the House Ways and Means Committee.

I, frankly, to be honest with you, sir, am trying to digest the latest draft of that which came out last night. I understand that they have integrated the depletion decline with, at the same time, a decline in the windfall profits tax so that five years from now, in summary form, the depletion would be zero and the price of so-called "old oil" would have risen from approximately \$5.25 to \$8.25 a barrel.

I am not positive of those numbers, but that is as near as I can work out the mathematics.

If that resulted in the industry having profit increases of somewhere between 100 percent to 300 percent, would the Administration be as equally relaxed as it is on proposing this concept?

SECRETARY MORTON: It beats the hell out of me, Fred.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I do not know. I think we got snockered and snowed a little bit in the whole area. There is a political area here that you have to realistically deal with. I found this to be true when I was on the Ways and Means Committee.

If you will remember, when the big tax bill went through the House, there was a lot of blood on the floor as to the depletion allowance. George Bush and I tried to

compromise one percent, but it did not do much.

o

I wish I could really answer your question, but I cannot. I do not know how George Shultz feels about it, and I do not know how Bill Simon feels about it.

We have not had time to really discuss this since the Ways and Means Committee made these statements.

Is John Sawhill still here?
(No response.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I am going to fight for an orderly capital growth system because I think that is what it needs.

I price this Project Independence, as I see it through the eyes of Interior, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$300 billion.

That money has to come from the capital growth in the industry. It has to come from its credit, and its retained earnings, and its cash flow.

I hope that the attitude is prevailing now, particularly as we are seeing it harden up in terms of getting away from price controls, harden up in terms of letting the equilibrium take place in the market, that we are not going to go for any kind of a program that is going to really inhibit the capital growth of this industry. This is a political tightrope, as you know, and it is a very difficult one.

I think this is something that this National

Petroleum Council perhaps has not done enough work on; and that is, in the area of economics and capital growth.

We have not sold the idea of profit and retained earnings to the public. You know this, and I know this, and I do not know whether we can or not.

I know that the New York Stock Exchange has been trying to do it, the industry has been trying to do it through the television, and the Stockholders' Associations of America have been trying to do it, but profit has an evil connotation now, particularly in the minds of a lot of people.

When there is a change, a rapid change in profits due to a rapid change in price, as we have had in this industry, then, all of a sudden, it becomes completely simple.

I do not know how to overcome it. I think for my part and what I can contribute, I am going to try to do everything I can to make sure that this industry can pay the price of \$300 billion, or whatever is necessary, to increase its service to the public; to produce more oil, and to produce more energy in the various forms that you do. That is where we are.

I think we have to take a position on what Mills is saying and doing. I do not think the Administration has shaken down and taken that position.

MR. MONTAGUE: I am Kenneth Montague of General Crude Oil Company, Houston. 2 Mr. Secretary, my company is a small, independent 3 company that has been successful in the past in oil well lease sales, but recently has not been. 5 We find ourselves with no quarrel against the 6 bonsus system, but we do have a great deal of concern about 7 the size of the size of the savings. It seems to us we were brushed aside in the rush 9 for the few crumbs that the Government tosses out at each 10 one of these individual sales. 11 We heard the Administration, and I think you said 12 this morning that there is going to be an increased size of 13 I was wondering when this is going to occur? sales. 14 SECRETARY MORTON: Do you mean the size of the 15 individual sales, or the total number of acres offered a 16 year? 17 MR. MONTAGUE: Yes, sir. 18 SECRETARY MORTON: Which one? 19 MR. MONTAGUE: Any one. 20 We are at the three-million acres SECRETARY MORTON: 21 a year plateau right now. We came up from a million a year 22 ago, and we are operating on a three-million acre plateau 23 I do not know what is planned exactly. now. 24 Do you have a plan for 1975? Vince McKelvey is 25

here. Who is from BLM? Anybody?
(No response.)

SECRETARY MORTON: Vince, do you know what the exact acreage is or the planned sales that are all ready contemplated or those that we are considering for 1975?

MR. McKELVEY: I do not know the exact figures,
Mr. Secretary, but the plan that the President has asked to
be carried out would call for ten million acres in 1975,
with a reevaluation at that time, or at the end of that
time, what the level would be in the future.

SECRETARY MORTON: We may not hit the ten million, but we will be right on that doorstep. It will be some six or eight times the amount that has ever been offered before in that given time frame.

MR. MONTAGUE: Mr. Secretary, as a comment, I would suggest that consideration to increasing the individual size of these sales would put a lot more acreage into active development.

SECRETARY MORTON: We are going to have to do that.

A little bit of this will depend upon the nomination process
that we are using now in terms of the competition that we
would be getting from industry on the tracts themselves. I
think your point is well taken.

I do not think we can achieve a ten-million acre exposure of the Shelf to industry unless we very, very

substantially reduce the number of acres that we are putting up for sale; otherwise, we would be having a sale about every month, and, administratively, we just cannot do that.

MR. WEST: Mr. Secretary, I am Bob West, Tesoro Petroleum Corporation.

Getting back to the adversary position of the Government vis-a-vis the industry, it seems to me that the strongest adversary position resides in the Congress.

I would like to hear comments from you on what you think this Council or the industry can do to educate the Congress better, and to change its increasingly stronger adversary position to the industry back to one of more understanding and cooperation; and, hence, a continuation of the free enterprise system in the industry?

SECRETARY MORTON: You want to hear my political speech.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I do not know. I was talking to a fellow Congressman the other day. He has been there a long time, and has been there longer than I have, actually. We are old friends, but we never have agreed on anything.

I think that my comment to him was that we both agree that you can go for a long time in this business and not learn anything. We just have not agreed which one has had this experience.

## (General laughter.)

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SECRETARY MORTON: Of course, if I knew the answer to your question, I would be President of the United States. I will tell you that.

I am sure that the President would like to have the answer to that question. He would probably like to have the answer to it more than anybody.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I think, however, it is not an impossible job. I think we contact Congress usually at a time when it is sort of on an emotional wave. We respond to the things that are being said in Congress, as Fred pointed out, which really kind of shock us, in terms of taxation, which shock us in terms of formation of Federal corporations.

I got a whole, long treatment the other day by Patsy Mink's Subcommittee on Mines. The rationale that they had was this:

If the TVA is successful, why shouldn't we drill all the oil in this country with a Federal corporation?

It would be pretty hard to attack that loop because reason cannot find its way in.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: The way I think we can do it is to meet these people on their home ground; talk to them more when they are in their districts.

There is a funny thing about a Congressman. He is a peculiar element. Up here, individuals are the public. Back home, individuals are constituents, and there is one hell of a difference.

(General laughter.)

SECRETARY MORTON: I was there, Charlie.

I think what we do not do in industry and in business, and what I do not need as Secretary of the Interior is meet these guys on their home ground.

We always seem to confront them in front of a committee, behind a witness table, and that is a show; that is an entertainment to a large extent, in many cases, unfortunately, particularly since it is all being recorded in video.

The only way that I can say that we can do it, obviously, is to replace the ones you do not like with ones you do like, and that is a clicke that I guess everybody has heard.

I think we ought to meet with them and talk with them in their districts, on their home ground, and in their states, with the Senators, showing those people what the contribution of this industry, my industry, your industry, or whoever it is, is making in terms of jobs, in terms of the economic welfare of the area.

Acme Reporting Company

8-

I just think that this is the only short-term way that I see that can do it. I find that that is a very good thing. They have more time for you. They are honored and flattered by the fact that you have kind of come to them, and it has not been as a result of a subpoena.

I think this is an area where we can do it. You can be relatively free from the pressures of the media and the press that sort of have some influence on a Congressman's interview. I think that this is the way to go.

MR. MOEHLMAN: Mr. Secretary, I am Bob Moehlman, Newmont Oil Company in Houston.

I would like to note that we have a pressing, immediate problem on tubular goods. The Government bodies, of course, are aware of this. We know that Duke Ligon's office is working quite actively on it, but it is here with us.

Speaking as a consumer of tubular goods, and who wants to be a consumer of tubular goods, rather than circulating mud waiting for it, is there some way that the price controls on tubular goods can be lifted so that we can keep the steel in this country rather than letting it go out, and so that we can perhaps assure people from whom we borrow it that we are going to get it in the not too distant future?

SECRETARY MORTON: My understanding is -- I think

Duke's here, and he might answer the question, but I believe

Acme Reporting Company

we are looking at April 30th, are we not, Duke? MR. LIGON: Yes, sir; that is right. April 30th for the complete removal of controls. There have been some 3 controls lifted on the smaller plants. 4 MR. MOEHLMAN: That is thirty days from now. 5 the meantime, the pipe is moving out of New Orleans. 6 SECRETARY MORTON: If you can get anything done 7 around here in thirty days, consider it a success. 8 (General laughter.) 9 SECRETARY MORTON: A guy came into me the other 10 day with an application to build 5,400 miles of 42-inch 11 pipe. 12 I said, "Have you got it?" 13 He said, "Oh, sure. We can get it easy." 14 It is a problem. This back-up system is the thing 15 that really concerns me. The thing is, though, Bill Simon 16 has a pretty good philosophy. 17 He says, "If the price is right, I'll get the 18 piping." 19 You better believe it. This is a peculiar country. 20 There is more elasticity in this country than anybody ever  $^{21}$ gives it credit for. Those of us, and there are many here whose hair is 23 as gray as mine, who have lived through World War II -- well, 24 my father was always making airplane wings out of orange 25

crates. I know, because I had to fly one of them.

(General laughter.)

3.

SECRETARY MORTON: I, of course, have been talking with and jawboning with all of the steel people because not only are the back-up systems for this industry involved, but certainly for the mining industry.

We have had a hell of a time getting roof poles.

Can you imagine that?

It is a simple thing; a rod with a plate on it.

It is has been a very difficult thing, and the whole reason has been because of the price control. People just do not make things that are not profitable. You cannot blame them.

Hopefully, we are going to come out of that; and, hopefully, our basic industry is going to have a better capital growth situation than we have had.

I do not want to take any time, but the proposition has been that when we put the environmental costs on top of the normal manufacturing costs, and materials costs, and labor costs of a basic industry like steel, and you replace a plant like let us say Bethlehem has over here at Sparrow's Point, a great big plant that grew up under an entirely different environmental ethic than what is demanded now in terms of its response to the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and so on and so forth, there is no way that the cash flow from the old plant can provide enough capital to replace

itself with a new plant because of these tremendous additional systems costs that are added on to it.

This goes for your own refineries, too, and you know this.

We should take that into consideration in our tax system so that the capital growth is there, and we can move these basic industries ahead by replacing the old with the new.

We are not getting the kind of expansion in aluminum and in steel and in the roller mills and in the refineries that we need to keep up with the show.

I think the reason is because we have not recognized capital growth as a very, very important factor in the continuing growth of an industrial economy.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, again, Mr. Secretary, for your very frank and straightforward answers and comments. We certainly do appreciate your being here.

Let me interrupt. I see Chatski Owens is just leaving. I had intended to introduce him, and ask him for comments later on, but I certainly want to recognize Charles Owens, and to express our appreciation for his being here.

MR. OWENS: Thank you very much, Dave.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Again, Mr. Secretary, thank you.

We understand that you do have to leave shortly to catch an

airplane on one of your many travels. We do appreciate your 1 2 taking the time to be with us. To get into our own business this morning, we will 3 first have a report from the NPC's Committee on Energy 4 Conservation, an interim report on the first phase of the 5 study by C. H. Murphy, Junior, Vice Chairman of the Committee. 7 Charlie? STATEMENT OF C. H. MURPHY, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN, 8 COMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION 9 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, gentlemen 10 of the Council. 11 We have all had the experience of being associated with colleagues who would go to seemingly any length to leave 13 us with a chore to do for them. 14 Butch Granville is in New Zealand today, and that 15 has to be close to a record of some kind, 16 Butch and I have worked closely on this thing, and 17 we take some satisfaction in the progress that so far has been 18 made. 19 You will remember that at our summer meeting last 20 year, the Agenda Committee received a request that this 21 matter be taken up. 22 The Agenda Committee cleared it, and this Committee 23 was duly organized, and went to work. 24 You received the interim report just a few days 25

ago. This is an interim report that was in response to the Secretary's demand that we tell him how we are getting along.

I, therefore, want to emphasize that it is a progress report only.

In tackling this job, the Committee decided that it had to divide the thing into two phases, and this is the phase that I am talking about right now.

We then go into dividing the thing into what can be done in the short term, and then looking farther down the road at what can be done to save energy in the future.

We, of course, anticipate that the measures which will be implemented in the short run will have to be applied quite cautiously to be sure that they are not counterproductive over the longer haul.

In a minute, I am going to introduce Bob McKay, who will present the report on behalf of the Coordinating Subcommittee. Before I do, a couple of more observations seem to be in order.

The first is that this Committee is tackling the job of delving into the saving of energy in literally every area where any energy is used.

For example, we have had to go into industry and discuss steel, aluminum, pulp and paper.

Frankly, gentlemen, we did not feel smart about a lot of those things, so we felt it necessary to reach out

into those industries and to bring in expertise and experience probably to an extent that has not been found necessary before in the work of this Council.

After all, if we are dealing with a steel shortage, and the steel companies were undertaking to see how to save steel, we might appreciate being consulted on whether or not an intermediate type casing is necessary in our wells.

This is a major part of the activity, and it is somewhat time-consuming, I must say, and we are going forward with it, of course.

A second observation that I would like to make is the very one that was brought out so cogently by His Czarship here a little earlier in the day; and that is, that energy conservation is becoming a reality.

It must become more of a reality because of a sense of purpose on the part of the people. I join the Secretary and almost everyone else who has touched indirectly on the subject today, that as conscientious as our people are, the thing that is really going to make all of us most conscious of this necessity as consumers is price. I think we are seeing some effect of that right now.

An awareness, beyond price, does need to be stimulated on the part of the populace, and a great deal of work is being directed to do just exactly that.

At this time, I want to call on Bob McCay, who has

1.	
2 .	
3 -	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
1,1	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

done a yeoman's job here heading the Coordinating Subcommittee. Here is Bob McCay.

(The statement follows.)

STATEMENT OF R. C. MCCAY, CHAIRMAN, COORDINATING SUBCOMMITTEE

MR. McCAY: Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

The Committee working structure is made up of the Coordinating Subcommittee and six task groups. Four enduse task groups concern themselves with the broad areas of energy consumption: electric utilities, transportation, industry and residential/commercial.

In appointing members to each of the end-use task groups, as Charlie mentioned, every effort was made to see that both energy-consuming industries and energy-supplying industries, along with government, were adequately represented.

We thereby assured ourselves not only of having access to the requisite expertise, but also that the findings and recommendations of each group would have a balance and would have some internal consistency which might otherwise have been lacking.

A Patterns of Consumption/Energy Demand Task
Group was designed and set up to establish the energy and
economic framework, both for the present and through 1985,
within which the end-use task groups work.

The sixth group is the Consumer Task Group, whose function has been to interface with all other task groups and assess their findings and recommendations as to their

. .

acceptability to the public, the Government, and any concerned special interest groups.

Establishing the Consumer Task Group as part of this study, with a membership representing interests outside the petroleum industry, has been unique for the National Petroleum Council.

This task group is chaired by Howard McKinley of Continental Oil Company, and its membership is composed of representatives of the Rice Center for Community Design and Research, the United Auto Workers, the General Electric Company, a professor of management from MIT, the New York State Public Service Commission, the Sierra Club, and a Consumer Affairs Specialist.

This group is reviewing the energy conservation considerations developed by the end-use task groups from the viewpoints of their special concerns with regard to the economic impact on the consumer, changes in life style, economic effect on the nation, environmental concerns, impact on the industrial complex, government policy change considerations, and consumer response and education.

To date, these concerns have been assessed in broad terms. It is recognized that solutions to many of the programs will not be attainable during the short term of Phase I, but it is felt that initiation of action is imperative to move simultaneously toward both short- and long-

term goals.

This task group has met four times, and I have been present during a portion of each of these meetings. The other task group chairmen also were present during the third meeting.

I can assure you that this Consumer Task Group is functioning as an ombudsman, a conscience, and a veritable guardian of the consumer's interests.

We shall endeavor to pass their muster, in large part, which should add an extra element of credibility to the final reports of both Phases I and II.

The Coordinating Subcommittee coordinates the working groups, of course, and consolidates each group's work into a unified whole.

The concept of the definition of energy conservation within the framework of this study was given much deliberation by the Coordinating Subcommittee.

It was basically decided that we would primarily deal with "evolutionary" concepts rather than "revolutionary.' Stated simply, we visualize energy conservation as a natural reaction to economic incentive forces, primarily the rising cost of BTU's, rather than a mandated or dictated action which provides energy conservation without a natural free-enterprise driving force.

An exception to this philosophy is the analysis

which is being undertaken by the Consumer Task Group on the impact of rationing under both voluntary and mandatory curtailment.

This analysis has been specifically requested by the Government.

An additional concept of energy conservation which the Committee has been asked by the Government to consider is the evaluation of the possibilities of switching from less abundant to more abundant fuels.

Comminting further on the two phases of the study, as described by Charlie Murphy, Phase I is the short term, 1974 to 1978, and is concerned with what can be done by voluntary and administrative action and with little additional investment beyond that which is all ready scheduled.

It contemplates some changes in Government policies and consumer attitudes, but none so profound as to substantially affect our way of life.

Phase II, covering the period 1979 to 1985, differs from Phase I in that time is available for the planning and research that must precede the massive investment and social and governmental reorientation necessary if we are to have energy conservation play a meaningful part in achieving our national goal of energy self-sufficiency capability.

This Interim Report concentrates on the short term, 1974 to 1978, period. Initial efforts have been

23

24

25

centered on researching and evaluating studies by Government agencies, universities, trade associations, and industry.

The findings of this report are preliminary; however, short-term measures have been quantified to a limited extent.

The initial findings and proposed areas of additional study may be expanded or revised as the study progresses.

The final report on Phase I will be directed to further assessing and quantifying potentials identified in this report.

The Consumer Task Group has identified items relating to energy conservation that will require detailed investigation for a completely effective conservation program.

These areas are primarily concerned with price/demand elasticity, input-output, and other econometric studies which the NPC considers to be beyond the scope of its energy conservation study.

Task group participants will address the qualitative aspects of these.

The NPC recommends that quantitative research in " these critical areas be conducted under Government auspices.

In some cases, individual task groups have made all ready initial estimates of savings which will be quantified in the final report.

•

1,1

These savings would primarily result from citizen actions plus professional programs of energy management in the business sector, stimulated by an enlightened Government policy.

In some consuming sectors, there are examples of energy savings that exceed ten percent; however, at this time, there is not sufficient experience or data to substantiate the permanence of such savings in a continuing energy management program.

A major responsibility of energy management will be to guarantee that, once realized, energy savings levels are maintained.

Good energy management can have relevance for all users, from the large manufacturing firm to the home-owner and private motorist.

In all instances, an essential preliminary step should be to identify and quantify the various applications of energy within the user's control.

Once these are known, the potentials for energy savings can be investigated.

A key activity in an energy management program must be surveillance and control. In industrial and commercial establishments this will involve reducing heat losses, recyclying scrap and combustible waste, recovering waste heat, et cetera.

At the level of the individual consumer, the surveillance and control function must take the form of regular maintenance of all energy-using devices, with particular attention given to automobiles, home heating and cooling.

Major savings accrue simply by altering temperatures and decreasing illumination.

In addition, individuals must be convinced of the need to operate vehicles and appliances in an energy efficient manner.

In the household, this will entail instilling a sense of discipline in all family members. Once under way, a viable energy management program requires a continuing review of goals and strategies.

The governmental energy research budget should not only be directed to increasing energy supply, but should also give consideration to research in the area of end-use consumption.

Examples of areas where such research could be conducted are energy-use patterns for communities; community development which takes into consideration the possibility of mass transit systems to move people to and from work; intermodal transportation shifts; more efficient heating and cooling systems; increased recycling of energy-intensive materials; and increased substitution of communication for

travel.

For the most part, short-term savings in these areas will be small; however, if they are to have an effect on conservation efforts within the next five to fifteen years, preliminary study must begin now. The opportunities for major long-range impacts are promising.

Some of the proposed energy savings measures may require relaxation of environmental standards; for example, lead requirements for gasoline and desulfurization of fuel oil, or deferral of their implementation.

Any recommendation thereon must be considered cautiously due to human health considerations. Careful consideration must be given to evaluating the trade-offs of energy savings versus environmental and health costs.

In other areas of environmental concern, there continues to be controversy as to the most effective way to achieve environmental standards; one example is the disagreement between the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, and the electric utility industry as to the effectiveness and reliability of the stack gas scrubber.

This is an area deserving additional research and development work.

In the short-term, some oil- and gas-fired boilers and furnaces could be converted to burn coal; however, some sulfur restrictions would have to be relaxed.

Acme Reporting Company

Ð

Coal production and transportation capacity will have to be expanded. The coal industry is unable to significantly increase production to supply plants burning fuel oil and natural gas on the East Coast without building new capacity which would require at least three years.

However, a coal allocation program could be implemented that would divert a portion of current production to convertible plants.

Measures such as a coal allocation program and diversion of some transportation equipment to critical areas could offer some short-term relief.

An additional contribution that coal could make would be by increasing load factors on coal-fired utility plants, thus reducing the oil and gas requirements of an electric power system.

while this possibility has not been fully explored, it appears that existing transmission facilities are limited in their ability to distribute the added electricity to oil-or gas-consuming areas.

The current shortage of available fossil fuels puts a high premium on maintaining, or advancing, the scheduled commercial operating dates of nuclear power plants.

Units planned for operation in what are now oilor gas-dependent regions of the country should be expedited
to meet projected in-service deadlines.

a

The NPC's Emergency Preparedness Report has all ready identified and proposed a number of short-term transportation energy-saving measures; for example, lowering of highway speed limits, the development of computerized car-pool systems, et cetera.

The automobile industry appears well on the threshold of developing and/or shifting to more efficient models.

Consideration should be given to shifting passengers and freight to less energy-intensive modes.

At this juncture, the major shortcoming is an articulate, dynamic and forceful research and development program for a total systems program that reaches across all transportation modes.

This program should include the development of an integrated transport system capable of conserving energy and which is consistent with preserving life styles and/or accommodating a smooth pattern of social evolution.

The consumer will cooperate in solving the nation's energy problem if sufficiently educated and advised. There is a definite need for timely information which is complete, comprehensive and credible.

This must be a coordinated effort including consumer concern groups, educational institutions, communication media, Government and industry.

The consumer will be responsible to conservation

efforts over a period of time if there is equity in sharing 1 conservation burdens. It is, therefore, important that the consumer be 3 informed of Government and industry conservation efforts and 4 how he may be of assistance. 5 The consumer is affected most directly in his mode of living, working and transportation. Many of the savings 7 in these areas will require investment on the part of the 8 consumer and will probably not occur unless the consumer is given some direct aid. 10 An example of a positive incentive would be a tax 11 consideration for retrofitting insulation; a negative incentive would be a surcharge on excess energy usage. 13 Most of these incentives can only occur at state, local or Federal Government direction; such as, changes in 15 building codes, zonings, tax incentives, excise taxes, et 16 cetera. 17 A number of specific areas for potential energy 18 conservation will be developed by the individual task groups 19 in depth in the final report of Phase I. 20 Downstream and lateral effects will be evaluated 21 to the extent possible. Among these specific areas are included: 23 Evaluation of mass transit as a concept.

Acme Reporting Company

25

Impact of energy conservation on urban and

suburban life styles.

Recycle of scrap steel and aluminum.

Highway; car-pooling, emission controls.

Residential; insulation.

Commercial; utilization of utility customer service organizations to advise consumers on energy conservation

Electric utility; the effects of air and water quality measurements.

Charlie Murphy has mentioned that we have a total of 106 people working on this study, and we plan to be sure that the energy conservation measures which will be included in the final report will be reviewed with associations representing these industries so that we do have a concurrence of the user industries on the conservation measures that we display.

Now I would like to mention just a few words on the Phase II, covering 1979 to 1985. This Phase II report is scheduled for completion later this year, and the various task groups have been developing their plans of approach.

We must recognize at the outset that the longer the forecast period, the less sure we become as to any conclusions and recommendations that we may draw.

Take the matter of the technological base that is The easiest course would be to assume that we would assumed.

Acme Reporting Company

23

22

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

22.

merely draw on present technology, and that by 1985, we would have reached the limits of what could be done, given that base.

This would patently understate what our energy conservation accomplishments could be. As we all know, growth in technology is a function of need, either as expressed in the market place through rising prices, or under governmental pressure, as in time of war or other grave national necessity.

Rising energy costs will certainly spur private and industrial research and technical development. Governmental concern, if it takes the form of incentives rather than outright direction, will also do much to hasten the rate of discovery and rate of application of new discoveries.

On the other hand, we must avoid assuming scientific and technical advances that most probably and rightly belong in the Twenty-first Century.

We just cannot assume that we will be able to use hydrogen from the sea as a power source by 1985.

Another imponderable is the impact that energy conservation will have on public attitudes and our life style generally, and our task groups will have to weigh these considerations carefully.

But somehow, I myself feel that these will not be the problems that they may be in the short run, where

relatively abrupt changes may have to be considered. 1. Americans have certainly shown themselves to be an 2 adaptable people, and I am sure that a new and more pleasing 3 life style will slowly evolve. Charlie, this completes the summary of the - 5 6 Interim Report. MR. MURPHY: Bob, thank you very much. 7 Gentlemen, while the main Committee is by no means 8 shirking its policy responsibility here, I think it is plain to you that the work simply could not be done without these 10 various task groups. 11 I want to compliment Bob McCay and his task force; 12 they have really turned to. 13 Mr. Chairman, that is the best we can do at the 14 moment. 15 Here is the Interim Report in response to the 16 Secretary's request. I respectfully move, sir, its adoption 17 by the Council, and that the Executive Director be instructed 18 to hand the report to the Secretary. 19 CHAIRMAN TRUE: Gentlemen, you have heard the 20 Is there a second? motion. 21MR. OLMSTEAD: I second the motion. CHAIRMAN TRUE: Normally, the Council does not 23 approval all interim reports, but, certainly, this one is an 24 exception to that procedure. 25

1		I think i	n the	interest of hav	ving been	speci	fically
2	requested,	and also	of it	s importance, v	ve should	take	official
3	action to	approve i	t.			1	
4		Is there	any di	scussion?			
5		(No respo	nse.)			1. <sup>6</sup>	
6		CHAIRMAN	TRUE:	All in favor?			
7	77.	(Chorus o	of ayes	• }			
. 8	, i	CHAIRMAN	TRUE:	Any opposed?			g graph and
9		(No respe	onse.)				MONTH AND A
10	97 (N) 3	CHAIRMAN	TRUE:	So ordered.			Tipografia (n. 18
11		(The repo	ort fol	lows.)			
12							
13							
14						;	
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22		***	·				
23							
24							
25						-	

Acme Reporting Company

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Charlie, and thank you, Bob.

Having watched how closely Charlie has worked with the Chairman of the Committee, Butch Granville, and also having watched how hard the Coordinating Subcommittee has worked, I feel that these two gentlemen are exceptionally qualified to present this most important point.

Next, as you know, the NPC Committee on Emergency Preparedness certainly has been brought to task by the events of the last few months, particularly the embargo.

It is a very good example of how a seemingly routine report can explode into tremendous proportions.

I am embarrassed when I recall when I called Carrol Bennett and asked him to chair this Committee. I referred to it as an "update report," and one that should be very simple, based on his background with NPAD and NPGA, and his current involvement as Regional Administrator of that organization.

Certainly, I did not prepare him for the tremendous amount of work that this Committee has been called on to perform.

Carrol, will you update the report?

STATEMENT OF CARROL M. BENNETT, CHAIRMAN,

COMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Dave.

In the interest of time, I know we are running a little behind schedule, I am going to leave my prepared statement, I think, and just jog your memory a little as to what our original assignment was; and, as Dave said, that has changed considerably.

In fact, I told him the other day that I thought our Committee would set a record. We would be the first permanent committee of the Council because it seems that we get more assignments as time goes on.

If you will recall, our original assignment was to take a period, beginning in 1974 and in 1978, and anticipate a shortfall of a million and a half or three million barrels per day.

This, of course, became a reality in October of last year rather than a game. We requested then by the Secretary to assemble all of our dope on the 1974 case and provide him with that as soon as possible.

This, we did in a release on November 15th, which I am sure you all have copies of.

It was then felt, as time went on, since we had had no actual experience with the embargo situation and had to postulate our findings, we decided in February that perhaps to give the Secretary a better answer to his request, we should update our November 15th report.

The result of that is the one that was issued to

you today here, and I think you also have one at home. I believe it was mailed out.

We have had a new request by the Secretary for a study on materials, supplies, manpower, and the effects that they would have on exploration, drilling and production.

This Committee was formed recently, and Ken Hill accepted the Chairmanship of this Subcommittee, which is a subcommittee under our Coordinating Subcommittee of our main Committee.

Ken, if you will come up and give us a report on your progress.

(The statement follows.)

24

25

STATEMENT OF KENNETH H. HILL, CHAIRMAN,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MATERIALS AND MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS
FOR PETROLEUM EXPLORATION, DRILLING AND PRODUCTION
MR. HILL: Thank you very much, Carrol.

Secretary Wakefield's request for a study of the availability of materials, manpower and equipment necessary for the exploration, drilling and production of oil during the next two years, also asked the Council to indicate the probable limitations on drilling activity due to any shortage, and the duration and causes of such shortages, together with any possible measures to alleviate them.

We do not have to go into all of the details, but you all know -- it has been alluded to today -- that we are short of drilling rigs, onshore and offshore; casing, tubing, drill pipe, and tool joints are all hard to come by; the lead time on pumping units, sucker rods, downhole equipment, and many other things, has dramatically increased.

We are finding out that one of the major roadblocks is skilled manpower, which is almost impossible to recruit.

Hardly anything we use is easy to obtain, and lack of many of these short supply items can result in constraints to drilling and production maintenance.

Reduced abandonment programs have dried up the used casing and tubing supply while programs to increase

4.

5 6

8

7

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

 $^{24}$ 

25

production from old wells compete with new well completions for the same subsurface equipment and services.

To address Secretary Wakefield's request, the Subcommittee on Materials and Manpower Requirements for Petroleum Exploration, Drilling and Production, designated six task groups:

One on Outlook; one on Exploration and Drilling; Production Equipment; Tubular Steel; Well Servicing; and Gas Processing Plants.

In addition to Council member representation, several very knowledgeable persons were recruited for the task groups from manufacturers and suppliers of oil field equipment, from drilling and construction contractors, and from service companies.

This will assure us that the best information available on the present materials and manpower situation goes into the study.

During the first meeting of the task group chairmen, who are also members of the Subcommittee, it was agreed that since a number of significant equipment items have a present lead time of one to two years or more, a materials supply availability study would have more meaning if extended to three years.

The Department of the Interior concurs with this opinion, and the study will include 1974, 1975 and 1976.

21

22

23

24

25

The Outlook Task Group will also look ahead to 1980, considering the possible effect on the number of wells drilled and producing if various 1974 constraints are removed.

The tentative guidelines to be followed in this study include, among others:

It is assumed that there will be adequate economic incentives for industry to expand drilling and production activities within the limitations of available material, equipment and manpower during these three years.

It is assumed, further, that financing will not be a constraint for expansion of drilling and production operations of the oil producers, for for orderly expansion of capacity of the oil field equipment manufacturers, contractors and service companies.

No estimates will be made of the possible quantitative effect of any changes in prices and tax laws on the level of activities.

However, the qualitative effect of certain Government policies may be addressed and discussed.

Projections of oil and gas productions are not going to be within the scope of the study. Volume estimates necessary for projection of production and gas plant materials requirements will be consistent with the NPC report, "United States Energy Outlook," December, 1972.

Each of these six task groups have met, and have

started to work on their assignments. Our target dates are 1 2 to have a first draft report in June, and the final report in August. This is a formidable task, but with the quality of talent we have, made available by the Council and the 5 6 outside supporting industries, I believe it can be done. 7 Thank you very much. (Applause.) MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Ken. You will notice that he was introduced this 10 morning as a new member. It did not take us long to put 11 him to work. 12 (General laughter.) 13 MR. BENNETT: As to the remainder of our assignment, 14 which was the 1978 case, we have gone back to work on that 15 now, and hope by the next Council meeting that we will have 16 it available for your approval. 17 Since the report before you today is an interim 18 report of the interim report, or an update of the interim 19 report, I do not believe it needs to be accepted by the 20 Council necessarily. 21 That concludes my report. 22 CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Carrol, and 23thanks to you, Ken. 24 Certainly, this Committee and its Subcommittees 25

Acme Reporting Company

have done yeoman's service for the Council and for the industry.

Let us now turn to a status report of the NPC Committee on Petroleum Storage Capacity, which will be presented by Earl W. Unruh.

Earl?

STATEMENT OF EARL W. UNRUH, CHAIRMAN, TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM STORAGE CAPACITY

MR. UNRUH: Mr. Chairman, distinguished gentlemen, and members of the National Petroleum Council.

As you are aware, periodically, at the request of the Department of the Interior, the National Petroleum Council has conducted a survey of the availability of petroleum inventories and storage capacity.

These reports, in the past, have provided assistance in evaluating our emergency preparedness to withstand interruptions in our normal oil supplies, whether by domestic dislocation or by foreign intervention.

Last July, the Department of the Interior requested the National Petroleum Council to update its earlier studies on the nation's inventories of petroleum and storage capacities.

The Department recognizes the need for accurate information and a clear understanding of the fact that there is a substantial level of inventory which is completely

unavailable.

 $^{21}$ 

There is also an increment above the absolutely unavailable which is a necessity for continuity of operation. This is generally defined as the level below which problems, such as run-outs and shutdowns, begin to occur.

Only those supplies in inventory above this point can be considered available for consumption.

To prepare the update, as requested, and to study the situation in light of current problems, the Council established a Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Charles E. Spahr, Chairman of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio.

Charlie asked me to chair a technical subcommittee to survey and analyze the current situation. We are also attempting to define the levels of inventory of various products at which we can expect to have troubles in the future.

To those not familiar with the petroleum industry and its vast and sprawling operations, inventories generally mean only one thing; readily available supply.

We are attempting to show in our report, which is in the final drafting stage, that, first of all, to comprehend available supply, one must have an understanding of the nation's vast distribution system, its modes and its limitations.

Secondly, it is necessary to understand the distinction between total inventories and available inventories.

Absolute, unavailable inventory is tied up in pipeline line-fill, refinery operations and facilities, and in tank bottoms.

Pulling everything down to this absolute, unavailable inventory level would represent a "shutdown" or inoperable situation.

To operate on a normal basis, an additional, substantial increment of inventory is necessary for continuity of operations, and must also be considered unavailable for consumption.

Again, the readily available inventory may be only a small percentage of total inventories reported and that we see published.

This report will provide national and regional information on the nation's inventories and storage capacities as they are distributed throughout the country.

Approximately 1,400 questionnaires were sent to all facets of the industry where primary inventories of crude oil and refined products exist.

Secondary or consumer storage, such as that of chemical companies, utility companies, railroads, trucking companies, or the military, was considered beyond the scope

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of our study.

It is our purpose to make this report as meaningful and helpful as possible to the Department of the Interior and agencies involved in petroleum energy supply and distribution

The work of the technical subcommittee should be completed in approximately one month.

After the parent committee has received and approved the report, it will be mailed to members of the Council for their approval.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the status report of the Committee on Petroleum Storage Capacity.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Earl.

We certainly look forward to receiving your final report.

Next, Wilton Scott, Chairman of the main committee, and Cecil Olmstead, Chairman of the Coordinating Subcommittee will report on our new study request undertaken by the NPC Committee on Ocean Petroleum Resources.

> STATEMENT OF WILTON E. SCOTT, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON OCEAN PETROLEUM RESOURCES MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Dave.

As the Secretary mentioned this morning, in January of this year, the Department of the Interior requested the

Council to undertake additional studies concerning ocean

petroleum resources in order to assist Interior and the other

U T

\_

concerned agencies of the Government in the further preparation for the Third Law of the Sea Conference under the auspices of the United Nations which will be held this summer in Caracas, Venezuela.

This study will be the fourth in a series which has been undertaken by the Council regarding oil and gas potential and development on the Continental Margin.

previous issues addressed have included international community interest in freedom of navigation, including that in the international straits, security of investment in mineral resource development in offshore areas, marine pollution, accommodation of multiple ocean uses, and compulsory settlement of disputes within the context of the international negotiations which have been taking place in the United Nations since 1968.

The Council's original study, completed in March, 1969, provided a comprehensive analysis of the complex problems involved in the exploration and development of petroleum resources under the ocean floor, with careful consideration of the U.S. energy policy objectives and geological, technological, ecnomic, legal and multiple-use aspects.

It is worth reminding you, perhaps, in view of the current energy supply problems, what the Council said in its March, 1969 report in this regard. I will quote four statements included in that report:

"The United States is dependent upon continuing adequate and secure supplies of energy."

"Petroleum, the leading source of energy, will be needed in increasing quantity far into the future."

"A healthy and expanding domestic petroleum industry is essential to the security of the United States and the defense of the free world."

"The ratio of U. S. reserves to production and the rate of new discoveries on land are in a declining trend.

"It is imperative that the United States Government take all appropriate measures toward assuring the availability of additional domestic reserves."

Unfortunately, these words are only now beginning to be heard.

That comprehensive report of March, 1969, was based largley on 1968 data. The new study request asks that the Council update that 1969 report, expanding it to include the potential for offshore oil and gas discovery and development around the globe.

It further solicits consideration of certain other questions relating to vessel transport of petroleum, marine pollution and settlement of disputes.

The United Nations' Third Law of the Sea Conference will involve well over 100 nations, and will probably be the

largest conference ever held by the United Nations.

It is perhaps the most significant and complex conference ever conducted on ocean issues.

The significance of the subject matter, and the broad nature of this new study is recognized by Secretary Morton, who will serve as the Co-chairman of the Main Committee.

Reporting to the Main Committee is a Coordinating Subcommittee supported by four task groups, the chairmen of each of which are members of the Coordinating Subcommittee. The four task groups are organized, as follows:

One, the Offshore Exploration and Production.

Two, Ocean Tankers and Deepwater Port Facilities.

Three, Finance and Economices; and

Four, Legal.

The Coordinating Subcommittee held its first meeting last week on March 21. I have asked Cecil Olmstead, Vice President of Texaco, Inc., and Chairman of the Coordinating Subcommittee, to outline for you the manner in which we intend to tackle this new assignment.

The Government Co-chairman who is working with Cecil is Jared Carter, Deputy Under Secretary of the Interior Department.

Before calling on Cecil, however, I would remind you that we are going to have to have assigned to these

1 various working groups a number of technical experts, and 2 I urge you all to work with us in that respect because 3 with that, I am assured that the Council will be able to 4 mount and make a thorough study of this additional report. Cecil, will you take over? 5 After that, Mr. Chairman, that will conclude our 7report. Cecil? 8 STATEMENT OF CECIL J. OLMSTEAD, CHAIRMAN, 9 COORDINATING SUBCOMMITTEE, OCEAN PETROLEUM 10 RESOURCES COMMITTEE 11 MR. OLMSTEAD: Thank you, Scottie. 12Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, ladies and 13 gentlemen. 14 If you would indulge me just a moment before I 15 get into this, I noticed when the Government representatives 16 here departed, the high intensity television lights went 17 down, the roar of the video machines turned off. I thought 18 for a moment this was an energy conservation measure. 19 I thought a little more about, though, and I was 20 reminded of a story that the late Judge John Parker told 21 once. Some of you knew him. He was the Chief Judge of the 22 Federal Court of Appeals down in the Southeast. A great man. 23 Judge Parker said that when he was early on the 24bench, he was observing another judge in a trial case, and

25

a young lawyer came in.

2

He was loaded down with books, and documents, and evidence of every kind under the sun, and a string of wit-

4

3

nesses from here to there.

5

6

7

what the law is."

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When he started to present his case, the Judge said, "Young man, don't bore me with the facts, just tell me

Just as we were getting down to reviewing the work of the NPC, which gets into the vital energy issues of the day, I noticed that some people do not want to be bored with the facts, or perhaps we do not have the glamour of those who departed.

Mr. Chairman, one would have thought that since 1968, when the National Petroleum Council began the first of its several studies on Law of the Sea and petroleum relations thereto, that we would have said all there was to say on that subject.

In other words, if it could not be said in three reports, why should we think another report will add anything significant. Let me see if I might suggest why.

First, the NPC has been attempting to zero-in on targets that have proven to be rather rapidly moving ones. During the time frame from 1968, when our work in this area commenced, there have been dramatic changes in fundamental energy relationships along with improved technological means

\_

8 .

 $^{23}$ 

of finding and producing petroleum from the seabed.

Second, the negotiating positions among nations in the United Nations Seabed Committee, in preparation for the forthcoming Caracas Law of the Sea Conference, have provided parameters or guidelines for a more precise defintion of U. S. national position.

Third, environmental concerns affecting both ocean transport of petroleum and exploration and production of offshore petroleum have introduced new dimensions to all ready complex subject matter.

Thus, it is important that our Government delegation at Caracas be currently and well-informed regarding the potential for oil and gas in various areas of the U.S. Continental Margin so that it may determine, as well as is practicable, the effect on the United States of various limits on coastal state mineral resource jurisdiction over the seabed.

That was why I was so anxious to hear the Secretary this morning reassure us that our position will include the entire Continental Margin which would greatly simplify this particular problem.

Also, the time frame for development of technology for seabed petroleum development in deeper waters is of critical importance to our Government as it prepares for Caracas.

Hopefully, our Committee will be able to update

the state of this technology.

Critical questions regarding the enforcement of pollution control standards with respect to petroleum tankers remain to be answered, as well as the determination of modalities and institutions for determining international pollution control standards both for vessels and seabed petroleum development.

Thus far, the National Petroleum Council has not addressed itself to definitive arrangements for mineral resource exploration and development in the seabed of the deep ocean area beyond coastal state jurisdiction.

should review this matter of regime for deep ocean mineral resource development; the existence of oil and gas in the deep ocean area beyond the Continental Margin certainly cannot be excluded; and, should the convention place limits on coastal state mineral resource jurisdiction which do not embrace the full Continental Margin, the outer portion of that margin might be subject to international arrangements or an international regime.

The economics of offshore petroleum production will be updated, and we intend to make comparative cost studies of oil and gas produced from deep water areas with that produced from alternative sources, such as shale, tar sands and gasification of coal.

Acme Reporting Company

9.

One aspect of this study imposes severe time limitations. Our Government delegation to the Caracas Conference would like to receive any information which can be made available while it is still preparing for the Conference

Thus, we intend to select certain top priority matters for interim analysis and study so that tentative preliminary comments and views can be furnished. Of course, this would have to be by the middle of May to be of any use in that process.

Now how are we organized to do the job?

As Mr. Scott stated, we are fortunate that Secretary Morton is serving as Co-chairman of the Main Committee. I think this emphasizes the importance the Government places upon this effort.

The Government Co-chairman of the Coordinating Subcommittee is Mr. Jared G. Carter, Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Four task groups are being organized to carry out each of the areas of the study:

The first, Offshore Petroleum Exploration and Production has as its Chairman Mr. John Sherborne of Union Oil Company of California, with Dr. Vincent E. McKelvey, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey as Co-chairman.

The second task group is Ocean Tankers and Deepwater Port Facilities. The Chairman of that is Captain

 $13^{\circ}$ 

Billy Smith of Gulf Oil Corporation, with Admiral William
M. Benkert, Chief of the Office of Marine Environment and
Systems, U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters, Department of
Transportation, as Co-chairman.

The task group on Finance and Economics has as its Chairman Mr. Richard E. Faggioli of the Exxon Corporation. With Mr. Darius Gaskins, Assistant Director, Policy Analysis/Economics, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Program
Development and Budget, Department of the Interior, as Co-chairman.

The Legal Task Group has as its Chairman Mr.

Northcutt Ely, the District of Columbia Bar, with Mr. Leigh

S. Ratiner, Deputy Assistant Administrator for International

Political and Economic Affairs, Federal Energy Office, as

Co-chairman.

Certainly, the Government and the industry have made available outstanding personnel to conduct this study.

And we are grateful for them.

About a year ago, or a little less than a year ago, the Council approved the 1973 report, entitled "Law of the Sea." You may recall that on the cover it had a large tanker.

Just so I can relate to you how that volume has been used, it was among the most referred to documents at the Geneva Committee meeting of the United Nations on the Law

of the Sea last summer, not only with our delegation, but it was not unusual to see delegates from other governments actually reading and studying that book.

I want the Council to understand, Mr. Chairman, that this work is having an impact.

I would also like to say, because I think too often perhaps we take the work of the staff of the Council for granted.

I would like to commend and thank Vince Brown and Max McKnight for the great support they have given now for five or six years to this work.

They have both taken a personal interest in it, and Max, particularly, has become one of the world's leading experts on it. I just want to make sure that that is understood.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that our ability as a nation and in industry to meet future energy requirements and to restore energy capacity here at home depends in substantial degree upon a rational regime for ocean uses and seabed mineral development, including petroleum.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Cecil, and thank you, Scottie.

It is indeed rewarding when we see the reports of

the Council used as extensively as the one Cecil mentioned has been used.

As you gentlemen know, the Council has several other studies in addition to the four we have had reports by chairmen on this morning.

Vince Brown, the Executive Director of the Council,
will now present a report on the progress of other committees.

STATEMENT OF VINCENT M. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

MR. BROWN: Since our last meeting, the Council has also been involved in completing its work in other studies we started some time ago.

The work outputs from the 1,000-man, four-year "U. S. Energy Outlook Study" is just about now totally complete.

Individual Fuel Task Group reports which supply the detailed, back-up information to that over-all study have been or are being published.

Reports on gas demand, nuclear energy availability, coal availability, oil and gas availability and gas transportation were issued since our last meeting.

Today, we are releasing the New Energy Forms Task Group report. I do not know whether they passed them out or not. There are some up there in the back of the room, otherwise.

This report discusses the potential contribution of

7.

unconventional energy forms, as well as the processes which can increase the efficiency of possible fuel electric power generating plants in the period 1971 to 1985.

The task group's examination of these fuels and technologies indicate that the nation will continue to be highly dependent upon hydrocarbons and nuclear energy through the Year 2000, and concludes that there is little possibility that new energy forms not all ready in an advanced state of development will have a significant impact on energy supply in this century.

If history is an indicator of the future, it is quite reasonable to expect that another energy resource will begin to emerge before the Year 2000.

This could be nuclear fusion, solar energy, or possibly, although unlikely, some other resource not yet discovered.

No matter which resource it happens to be, a great deal of diligent research and many years of development will be required before the United States can enjoy this potential resource.

Two final tas groups remain to be published;
Water Availability, and Energy Demand. Their publication
will conclude the NPC study on "U. S. Energy Outlook."

Computer programs were developed to facilitate the processing of data in two of the task groups' efforts in the

oil and gas and nuclear. In connection with those, the Council wanted to make these unique computer programs available to the public in the most beneficial manner for their continuing usefulness.

Thus, the NPC recommended, and the Interior

Department concurred, that the computer programs be offered to universities with the proviso that the contracting universities could make the programs accessible to the public at a reasonable cost.

A computer seminar was held in New Orleans in November to present the program to the universities.

Universities such as MIT, Colorado School of Mines, and the Universities of Southern California, Texas and Wyoming have all ready contracted for one or both of the computer programs.

The summary report of the Committee on Factors

Affecting U. S. Petroleum Refining was transmitted to the

Secretary of the Interior at the last meeting, the May 10th

meeting, 1973.

In the summary volume, the Committee discussed the economic, governmental, technological and environmental factors which affect the domestic refining industry's ability to respond to demands for essential petroleum products.

Last September, that Committee published an update

 $^{23}$ 

of the refining chapters of the 1967 report on the impact of new technology on the U.S. petroleum industry.

The final report of the Committee, which will supply the back-up data and analysis for the summary report, will be ready for publication late this spring.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Vince.

Duke R. Ligon is with us today. He has a dual capacity in connection with the Government and our industry. As you know, he is the Director of the U. S. Office of Oil and Gas, and he is also the Assistant Administrator of the Federal Energy Office for Policy, Planning and Regulation.

When he moved away from the head table as the lights went down, I wondered if he is just so used to testifying before committees with television facilities that he did not feel at home without them, but I am delighted to see him back.

Duke, we would appreciate any comments you might care to make to the Council.

STATEMENT OF DUKE R. LIGON, DIRECTOR,

U. S. OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

MR. LIGON: Thank you, Dave.

I think you had enough speeches and reports this morning to last you for a while, and I am not going to burden you with anymore.

I did want to say that on behalf of Bill Simon, in the Federal Energy Office, as well as Secretary Morton, in the Department of Interior, I want to thank sincerely the NPC and the various committees that have been involved in much constructive work for both of those agencies and departments here the last year.

Particularly, a special thanks to Carrol Bennett and his committee. They, indeed, were brought to task under a great deal of pressure.

The kind of help and support that these committees and you, as members of the National Petroleum Council, have given us throughout the year has been appreciated very much.

I hope that in the future, you will continue to support us in the advisory role that you were intended to serve because that help is invaluable, and I am not kidding in any way about that.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you, Duke.

Let me express the Council's appreciation for all of the help, cooperation and assistance that you have given as an individual in our work.

Part of the responsibilities of any organization are budgetary. As the activities of the Council have escalated over the past few years, so have the budget requirements.

The very active Chairman of our Budget Committee 1 has worked hard on our pressing budget problems this past 2 year, and he will now present a report of that committee. 3 Jack Abernathy? 4 STATEMENT OF JACK H. ABERNATHY 5 CHAIRMAN, BUDGET COMMITTEE 6 MR. ABERNATHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 You know, this is an interesting committee report 8 I am going to give you. It will be very brief. 9 The first comment I would like to make is that I 10 am reporting to you from the only committee which does not 11 have Government participation. 12 (General laughter.) 13 MR. ABERNATHY: You have heard some excellent 14 reports today, as we have always had. You get from Secretary 15 Morton's and Mr. Simon's report, and even Duke's brief 16 remarks -- and, by the way, Duke, I sure appreciate your 17 staying as the last Government fact to hang on around here. 18 I sure appreciate that. 19 You can hear from what they told us today that 20 regardless of the form in which requests finally come to  $^{21}$ and are approved by the Agenda Committee, that we really 22 have not seen anything yet, I guess, in terms of the require-23ments of the Council; of course, that is a part of our role.

Acme Reporting Company

All of this costs money, and that is why I am here.

24

25

.

1,1

I should, I guess, give you a little history. Those of you who were here last July at the formal reorganization of the Council will remember that a budget in the amount of \$845,000 was adopted at that time.

That was an approximate \$200,000 reduction from the preceding year in which about \$1,050,000, if my memory is correct, was expended; the reason being that the very large, as quoted here earlier, 1,000-man report on the energy outlook was virtually complete, and it was thought maybe that we might drop back to a less frantic, if not less frenetic, pace.

Of course, the October War, and the Arab embargo changed all of that, and with the predictable result that approximately the 10th of January Mr. Brown and Mr. True advised the Budget Committee that based on the best guess that they could make in the midst of the frantic pace and the emergency pace truly on which the Council was operating, in a few, spare moments they had to think about the money, they suddenly looked up and it was nearly all gone.

As nearly as they could estimate, the requirements for the current fiscal year, that is, the year ending June 30, 1974, would be about \$1,365,000, approximately \$600,000 in excess as compared to the budget which had been adopted when you count a few carry-over things that we had not quite figured out either.

3.

•

1,1

 $^{24}$ 

The Budget Committee looked into this as well as we could. Incidentally, you can see that we were pretty nearly out of available funds at that time.

examination of the situation. You all may remember that you get a letter over my signature, which was dated January the 18th, one week later after we found out about this, or approximately so, that told you that there was an estimate of perhaps a \$600,000 shortfall or overrun, whichever way you want to put it, recommending that the members of the Council contribute approximately \$300,000 on a hurry-up basis, on the same basis on which they had originally made their contributions to the Council's work.

Incidentally, I might tell you that the response to that request for additional funds was quite gratifying to the Committee, and I know to Mr. True and certainly to Vincent Brown, in that I believe you told me yesterday afternoon, Vincent, that all but about \$25,000 of that is in right now, and that, of course, has reduced the pressure somewhat.

We made two other recommendations at the time to Chairman True. The first recommendation was that the Budget Committee be enlarged somewhat by the addition of representatives from some, another one or two or three of the larger contributors.

 $^{21}$ 

He responded by appointing Mr. Mike Wright of Exxon, and Mr. Butch Granville of Texaco to the Budget Committee, which previously had been composed of Mr. McLean of Continental, Mr. Swearingen of Amoco, myself, John Kelly, and Dean McGee.

We thought it needed a little broader representation.

Anyhow, the next recommendation that we made, which Chairman True also adopted, with the vigorous consent and assent of Vincent Brown, was what we chose to call an "Administrative Analysis Subcommittee" of the Budget Committee be appointed.

The idea of the Administrative Analysis Subcommittee was to take a real good, hard look at NPC operations.

As has been mentioned here earlier today, the costs of NPC
have been escalating rapidly in response to the requirements
from Government for assistance have escalated.

In fact, they have changed from around \$300,000 four years ago to about \$1,350,000 for the current year.

That is quite a gain.

The Budget Committee felt, in its responsibility to the Council members, that we will try to get a better grip on that.

Mr. True accepted that recommendation, and appointed this Administrative Analysis Subcommittee. The members of

Acme Reporting Company

that are Mr. J. O. Edwards, who is the Comptroller of the Exxon Corporation. He serves as Chairman of the Administrative Analysis Subcommittee.

Again, Mr. Cecil Olmstead, who wears more hats than anyone almost I know, who is Vice President and Assistant to the Chairman of Texaco.

And Mr. D. R. Voorhees, who heads the Employee Relations for Gulf Oil.

The Budget Committee, in a meeting, devoted some time to trying to really define the job, as we saw it, not to limit it exactly, but at least to give the Administrative Analysis Subcommittee some sort of a charge as to what they ought to be doing.

We wrote out and handed them, on their appointment, a list of actually eighteen separate questions. I will not try to read those to you.

Incidentally, these were not intended to limit the Subcommittee in any way. We want them to chase any leads that they thought were advisable, but we did want to give them some sense of direction and the concerns that the parent committee had, as we saw it outlined.

These eighteen questions fell into four general categories. The first one was the organization and procedures followed within the NPC organization, to provide liaison between program requirements and costs thereof.

Up to now, we have not really done as good a job,

I confess, that is involved in the process for some time of
relating requirements to costs as perhaps should have been.

The second general area of questions was to sharpen up and really make more effective the budgeting and fore-casting process.

The third area was to provide the Agenda Committee specifically with the financial and manpower implications of requests in advance of formal approval thereof.

We are going to do better, Jake, than we have been able to do so far.

Finally, to review and assure budgetary and expense controls within the actual administration of the National Petroleum Council office.

That was the situation as of approximately the end of January, at the time we sent out the letter and we received contributions.

The action that has been taken so far is that the Administrative Analysis Subcommittee has been appointed; it is working.

We are informed that the Budget Committee can expect their complete report sometime, hopefully, by the first of May, and certainly no later than the 15th, at which time, the Budget Committee will meet to receive their report, and consolidate it with our own ideas.

I might as well warn you that the Administrative Analysis Committee confirms our suspicion that there will be some shortfall this year.

The method of handling that will possibly take the form of -- and, incidentally, the Administrative Analysis

Committee will also help us with the definition of a budget for the coming fiscal year, Fiscal Year 1975.

Hopefully, late in May, or at the latest, early

June, we will be able to send out to the Council members a

budgetary request for contributions for Fiscal Year 1975,

which request will include a request for the funds necessary

to complete the current fiscal year, along with such other

items it seems appropriate to report at that time.

Obviously, we may have short of a shortfall at that time, and some of the larger contributors, it will be suggested, frankly, that maybe they might hurry and get their contributions in in order that we do not have to go to the bank too often, Jake, like you used to do.

That completes my report, Mr. Chairman. I hope the members now have sufficient warning to anticipate the letter on or about June 1st requesting funds.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TRUE: Thank you very much, Jack.

Thank you and your committee for the work you have done and the contribution you are making.

It seems like all of our committees this year have 1 been called on to make greater and greater contributions 2 than historically the same committees were called on to make 3 in the past. Is there any other business to come before the Council? 6 (No response.) 7 CHAIRMAN TRUE: Mr. Hamon, do you have anything 8 else? 9 I move we adjourn. MR. HAMON: 10 CHAIRMAN TRUE: Before you do that, Mr. Hamon, 11 and you have no further business, I would like to conclude 12 my welcome of the new members of the National Petroleum 13: Council, and urge you to become involved in the Council's 14 work, and to participate and work on committees. 15 I am sure you will find it most rewarding. 16 There will be a press conference immediately 17 following adjournment in the Secretary of the Interior's 18 Conference Room, which is Room 5160, of this building. All 19 interested parties are invited to attend. 20 I would thank you all for being with us, with 21 particular thanks to those of you who have actively partici-22pated. 23 The meeting of the Council is hereby adjourned. 24 (Whereupon, at 11:58 o'clock a.m., the meeting

25

and ja	1
1	2
	3
٠.	4
* .	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	1,1
	12
<i>}</i>	13
	14
:	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
,	22
	23
	24

was adjourned.)

-00000-

Acme Reporting Company

## CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

reporter, do hereby certify that the testimony which appears in the foregoing matter was taken by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties in this matter, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this Proceeding.

OFFICIAL REPORTER
ACME REPORTING COMPANY